

# REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the captioned application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-14, 17-21, 26-29, 31-42, 45-49 and 58-60 are pending.

Claims 1, 3-14, 29 and 31-42 were rejected as being rendered obvious by Warsta (US 2004/0181550) in view of Malik (US 7,003,551).

Claims 17-21, 26-28 and 45-49 were rejected as being rendered obvious by Warsta in view of Malik and further in view of Kobata (US 2002/0077986).

Claims 58-60 were rejected as being rendered obvious by Warsta in view of Malik and further in view of Mattis (US 6,128,623).

The rejections are the same as in the prior office action, and the applicants maintain, without repeating, the arguments presented in the reply to the prior office action. However, the following is emphasized:

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, that in response to an instruction to forward an item of multimedia content to a second multimedia device, “transcoding said stored multimedia content for playback on said second multimedia device.” The other independent claims have a similar limitation.

The quoted “said stored multimedia content” is the original version of the content introduced in the initial storing step of claim 1. It is *not* the copy of the firstly transcoded version of that content that was attached to the instruction to forward the content to the second device. The significance of this was explained in the Background section of the application:

when content that was previously transcoded for playback on one mobile subscriber device is sent from the mobile subscriber device to another mobile subscriber device, the transcoded content is typically transcoded again by the MMSC for playback on the intended recipient’s device. This typically results in a lower


playback quality than would be the case if the original content was transcoded for playback on the intended recipient's device.

1:31 – 2:5. In the method of claim 1, this problem is overcome because the transcoded content is *not* transcoded again for compatibility with the second device. Rather, the original version of the content is transcoded for compatibility with the second device. Therefore, there is no additional reduction in quality resulting from transcoding a previously transcoded version.

Warsta and the other references on which the rejections relied do not disclose or suggest what is claimed. If device #1 sends content for delivery to device #2, the Warsta system checks if a version of that content that is compatible with device #2 is cached. If it is not cached, the Warsta system will transcode the content to be compatible with device #2. However, Warsta does *not* disclose or suggest that it will go back to the original version of the content, as opposed to transcoding the version sent from device #1 that already had been transcoded to be compatible with device #1. This is the very problem quoted above from the background section of the captioned application. In this regard, Malik and the other references do not add anything to the Warsta disclosure.

For the above reasons, the applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the captioned application.

Respectfully submitted,

  
L. Friedman  
Reg. No. 37,135

20 July 2010

HUSCH BLACKWELL SANDERS LLP  
WELSH & KATZ  
120 South Riverside Plaza, Suite 2200  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 655-1500